

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

1. Claims 1-2, 7-10, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris (US Patent 5,630,148) further in view of Kelkar (US Patent 7,194,254).

5 **Response:**

Claim 1

On page 8 of the Office action dated 11/29/2007, Examiner states that Norris and Kelkar combined accurately teach the limitation of a table including addresses of web pages and frequency/voltage settings of the processor for the web pages, using the table to
10 select frequency/voltage set to the processor according to an address of a web page.

However, in light of the reasons stated below, the applicant respectfully points out that it is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kelkar's restricted URL list consisting of addresses of web pages with Norris' performance state table.

15 Note is respectfully made by the applicant that MPEP 2143.01, subsection V "THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION CANNOT RENDER THE PRIOR ART UNSATISFACTORY FOR ITS INTENDED PURPOSE," recites:

"If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified
20 **unsatisfactory for its intended purpose**, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification." (*emphasis added*)

In col. 6, lines 23-26, Kelkar states, "In accordance with the present invention, a **restricted** URL list file 140 is stored within the card memory 120. This file will contain the **list of URLs that need to be restricted for access**". In addition, Kelkar further
25 teaches that the restricted access ranges from total barring of access to minimal restriction of access (col. 6, lines 42-44). Therefore, when a URL is not contained within the restricted URL list taught by Kelkar, the browser application operates using the unrestricted URL in full operation and access (col. 7, lines 15-18). In view of Kelkar's disclosure, the applicant respectfully points out that Kelkar's restricted URL list **only**
30 includes URLs with restricted access; in other words, URLs with full access (i.e.,

unrestricted URLs) are excluded from the restricted URL list. If Kelkar's restricted URL list is combined with Norris' performance state table, the modified Norris' performance state table **only** includes processor clock frequency settings for any **restricted** web pages having URLs included in the restricted URL list. However, the combined teaching of Norris and Kelkar **does not assign performance states for those unrestricted URLs**.

(emphasis added) As a result, when an unrestricted URL requesting a processor intensive function is accessed, Norris' computer system using the modified performance table fails to select high performance mode of the processor during processor intensive function invoked by the unrestricted URL; similarly, when an unrestricted URL requesting an interactive function is accessed, Norris' computer system using the modified performance table fails to select power conservation mode of the processor during the interactive function invoked by the unrestricted URL. In short, regarding the unrestricted URLs that might invoke either processor intensive functions or interactive functions, the dynamic switching between high performance mode and power conservation mode for the unrestricted URLs fails to operate normally. The applicant respectfully points out that Norris' computer system, modified by teaching of Kelkar, is unable to achieve the intended purpose of performing dynamic management of processor performance and power consumption of the processor based on the execution requirements of the application programs. In accordance with MPEP 2143.01, subsection V "THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION CANNOT RENDER THE PRIOR ART UNSATISFACTORY FOR ITS INTENDED PURPOSE," the applicant therefore asserts that a person skilled in the art is not motivated to combine Kelkar's wireless communication device for accessing URLs with Norris' computer system.

Another note is respectfully made by the applicant that MPEP 2143.01, subsection VI "THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION CANNOT CHANGE THE PRINCIPLE OF OPERATION OF A REFERENCE," recites:

"If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would **change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified**, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie

obvious.” (*emphasis added*)

On page 9 of the Office action dated 11/29/2007, Examiner states, “Norris and Kelkar combined accurately teach the limitation of a table including addresses of web pages and frequency or voltage settings of the processor for the web pages, using the table to **select frequency or voltage set to the processor according to an address of a web page**”. However, this is against Norris’ teaching directed to selecting a performance state of a processor for an application program. Norris teaches that the performance manager changes the performance state of the processor in response to a **request from the application program or a monitoring result of a cursor for the application program** (col. 4, line 54 – col. 5, line 27). If the performance state table of Norris is modified to have a specified frequency setting dedicated to each restricted URL included in Kelkar’s restricted URL list, the selection of the frequency setting of the processor is based on the address of the restricted web page (i.e., restricted URLs), rather than requests or cursor monitoring results of application programs. Therefore, due to the modified performance state selection, the suggested combination of cited references requires a substantial reconstruction and redesign of the elements in Norris’ computer system to operate in a different way. In accordance with MPEP 2143.01, subsection VI “THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION CANNOT CHANGE THE PRINCIPLE OF OPERATION OF A REFERENCE,” the applicant asserts that it is not obvious to a person skilled in the art to combine Norris’ computer system with Kelkar’s communication system.

In light of at least above reasons, the applicant asserts that claim 1 should be found allowable over the combined teaching of the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection made to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 2

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 7

On page 9 of the Office action dated 11/29/2007, Examiner also states, “By

programming to a specified frequency obviously the frequency is changed; however, the core voltage is also affected”. The applicant disagrees. As well known to those skilled in the art, changing the operating frequency of the processor is independent of changing the core voltage of the processor. In other words, changing the operating frequency does not affect the core voltage and vice versa. Therefore, as Norris fails to teach or suggest changing the core voltage of the processor, claim 7 should be found allowable over the combined teaching of the cited references. Additionally, claim 7 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 8

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 9

In light of above statements under Claim 1, the applicant asserts that claim 9 should be found allowable over the combined teaching of the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claim 10

Claim 10 is dependent on claim 9, and should be allowed if claim 9 is found allowable.

Claim 15

Referring to above statement under Claim 7, the applicant asserts that claim 15 is neither taught nor suggested by the combined teaching of the cited references. Additionally, claim 15 is dependent on claim 9, and should be allowed if claim 9 is found allowable.

Claim 16

Claim 16 is dependent on claim 9, and should be allowed if claim 9 is found allowable.

2. Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris (US Patent 5,630,148) in view of Kelkar (US Patent 7,194,254) as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Brown et al. (US Patent 7,149,905).

Response:

Claim 3

On page 9 of the Office action dated 11/29/2007, Examiner states that Brown teaches generating and downloading a new voltage selection table containing the optimum voltage setting for the unassigned entry. Brown does teach downloading a new voltage selection table containing the optimum voltage setting; however, Brown fails to teach or suggest generating the optimum voltage setting by **tracking the CPU workload during the processing of the web page**.

In col. 6, lines 38-39, Brown merely states that an initial optimum voltage setting for the new processor is determined, but is silent on how to obtain the initial optimum voltage setting. In addition, in col. 7, lines 9-12, Brown merely discloses that extensive testing may have been performed on the processor to determine a supply voltage, but neither teaches nor suggests that the extensive testing includes **tracking the CPU workload during the processing of the web page**. As the claimed limitations “tracking the CPU workload during the processing of the web page” and “calculating an optimal frequency or voltage setting for the CPU based on the CPU workload during the processing of the web page” are not taught or suggested by Brown’s teaching, the applicant asserts that claim 3 should be found allowable over the combined teaching of the cited references. Additionally, claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 11

In light of above statements under Claim 3, the applicants asserts that the claimed limitations recited in claim 11 are neither taught nor suggested by combined teaching of the cited references. Additionally, claim 11 is dependent on claim 9, and should be allowed if claim 9 is found allowable.

Allowable Subject Matter


As independent claims 1 and 9 are found patentable over the cited references according to above statements, the applicant believes that claims 4-6 and 12-14, dependent on claims 1 and 9 respectively, should still remain in the allowable state.

Conclusion

In light of above statements, the applicant asserts that all of the limitations recited in independent claims 1 and 9 are not taught or suggested by the cited prior art, alone or in combination. Claims 1 and 9 therefore should be found allowable over the cited prior art. Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1 and 9 is respectfully requested. In addition, should an allowance be made for claims 1 and 9, the applicant respectfully requests a quick allowance for claims 2-3, 7-8, 10-11, 15, and 16 being dependent upon claims 1 and 9 respectively.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,



Date: 01/08/2008

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)